

REMARKS

With the addition of claims 9-11, claims 1-11 are now pending in the above-referenced application.

With respect to the prior art rejection, as already explained in the prior response of April 7, 2005, Brown does not show two sealed volumes as claimed in claim 1. The two volumes denoted by 38 and 40 by the Examiner constitute seals or sealing rings which, when the sensor is installed according to Figure 1, are used outside the housing for the purpose of separating the housing from the media (cf. in this respect, col. 4, lines 11 to 20). Neither 38 nor 40 have a direct connection to diaphragm 30, which can be seen clearly in Figure 1 as well. As a matter of fact, volumes 20 and 22 must be considered comparable volumes, a medium being introduced at least into volume 20 (cf., among others, Brown, col. 4, lines 64 to 66, in conjunction with col. 5, lines 29 to 32, but also Applicants' argumentation of April 7, 2005, in particular with respect to volume 22). From the text, col. 4, lines 11 to 20, it can also be inferred that an external pressure is introduced both into volume 20 and into volume 22, the pressure being utilized to generate the differential pressure:

From Eickhoff et al, at most, it can implicitly be inferred that chamber 12 is sealed (cf. col. 4, lines 56 to 58, in this context). In specific terms, however, it is described only that chamber 12 is sealed or closed off from the environment lying above, via diaphragm 13. To what extent chamber 12 is sealed off from the environment lying below as well cannot be inferred from the specification. As a result, Applicants submit that the use of two separate (gas) volumes cannot be gathered from the publication by Eickhoff et al. either.

Furthermore, Eickhoff et al clearly describes a pressure sensor and not a force sensor (cf., among others, the title of the Eickhoff publication in this regard). Thus, Applicants submit that even an overall view of the publications by Brown and Eickhoff et al. does not show all the features of our independent claims.

Applicants are unable to follow the argumentation against claims 2 and 7, which the Examiner bases on the text passage in Brown, col. 2, lines 63 – 65. In the mentioned text passage it is described only that the pressure sensor may be used in various media. That the same medium is used in the sealed volumes 20 and 22 is not described in this text passage. Rather, air or other gases or liquids may be used in volume 22 (col. 4, lines 3 to 9). In contrast, using connection 22, a medium that may have an aggressive effect on gel 52 or circuits 32 in volume 22 is introduced (col. 5, lines 29 to 32). Applicants therefore submit

that it cannot be inferred that the media in both volumes 20 and 22 have the same temperature.

Applicants also have a different interpretation of the text passage (col. 4, lines 64 – 68) which the Examiner cites as reason for supporting the rejection of claims 3 and 8. As a matter of fact, this text passage describes the connection of sensor chip 30 on a bonding surface 26 with the aid of a eutectic layer 28. Thus, it is merely shown that no exchange of the media between volume 20 and 22 takes place. In order to clarify this distinction, the claims have been amended to recite that the recited volumes 20 and 22 are hermetically sealed with respect to the environment.

To further clarify the delimitation with respect to the claimed invention, Applicants further submit dependent claims 9 and 10, which are specifically directed to sealed gas volumes.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 192 (B.N. 45,172)

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

Dated: 11/29/05

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200